

cen

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/684,282	10/10/2003	Patrick A. Costello	21863	3340	
26327 7590 04/27/2007 THE LAW OFFICE OF KIRK D. WILLIAMS					
PO BOX 61538				ZLO, JOHN	
DENVER, CO 802	DENVER, CO 80206-8538			PAPER NUMBER	
			2616		
		•			
SHORTENED STATUTORY PE	RIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTH	IS	04/27/2007	PAI	PER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/684,282	COSTELLO, PATRICK A.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		John Pezzlo	2616				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	-			
WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a re vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communicat NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
		action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E		•				
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
4)	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>10 October 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	eceived in this National Stage				
± -	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not r	eceived.				
Attachmen		_					
1) Notic	mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date						
3) 🔯 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) D Notice of Inf	ormal Patent Application				
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/21/05, 4/1/05, 3/30/05</u> .	6)	e.				

Art Unit: 2616

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 7,184,443 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because comparing the independent claims of the application (1, 5, 7, and 11) against claim 1 of the patent both the patent and the application identify a set of requests for packets to sent from the input of a switch to the output of the switch, both maintain a grant start position, both determine a grant advancement position, both update the grant starting position, both maintain a sequence of the requests.

Art Unit: 2616

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art to utilize the patent. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the patent exists and has already been developed saving time and money and allowing a faster time to market.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. Schweinhart et al. (US 2003/0032391 A1) discloses a low latency handling of TCP messages in a broadband satellite communication system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Pezzlo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin, can be reached on (571) 272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2616

Washington, D.C.

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Jefferson Building

2A15

500 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA, 22313.

John Pezzlo

23 April 2007

JOHN PEZZLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER